

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VI

APRIL 1911

NUMBER 7

## Editorial

### UNIFORM GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY

At the Baltimore meeting of the American Philological Association, in the Christmas week, 1909, Professor Hale read a paper entitled "Conflicting Terminology for Identical Conceptions in the Grammars of Indo-European Languages" (abstract printed in the *Proceedings*, p. xi). In this paper he showed how what looked, on all the evidence, to be one and the same construction in all the languages studied in our schools might have to be explained, in a given school, in as many different ways as there were different languages studied. He held that the fundamental conception of this was scientifically false, and the pedagogical result bad; for there was, in his opinion, a great mass of constructions inherited in common by these languages, and to give different names for the same thing in several languages was to burden the memory and to produce confusion instead of the sense of order and harmony.

At the meeting of the American Philological Association in Providence in 1910, Professor Hale offered resolutions, which were passed, empowering the Executive Committee, if co-operation should be asked by the Modern Language Association in the appointment of a joint committee on the subject, to accede. He was himself to read a paper on the subject of terminology before the Modern Language Association in New York, and it seemed possible that this might be the result.

In addition to the paper read in New York, Professor Hale submitted, in printed form, a tentative scheme for the treatment of the moods in French, Italian, Spanish, English, and German,

based on comparative study, with confirmatory evidence here and there from Latin and Greek.

The matter took a turn which had not been foreseen. After Professor Hale had left the meeting in New York, he was made a member of an already existing Committee of the Modern Language Association, on Grammatical Nomenclature. This committee was appointed in 1908; but its time had been taken up mainly with another task which had later been put upon it, namely, the selection of typical texts for modern language reading in the schools.

This committee is made up of well-known investigators and teachers from various parts of the country. Its chairman was Professor Loiseaux, of Columbia University. But since the meeting Professor Loiseaux, feeling that the work would require more time than he can give, has resigned the chairmanship, while retaining membership; and Professor Hale has recently been made chairman of the committee.

The English Commission, which has been engaged for two years in the study of terminology and has now published its report, has held twenty-four meetings, averaging over three hours in length. The committee of the American Modern Language Association, being scattered over so wide a territory, cannot, of course, hold so large a number of meetings. The labor of carrying on among fifteen members discussions on the entire grammatical terminology of so many languages will be very heavy. But it is hoped that it can be accomplished, and the results are certainly to be awaited with much interest.

## HORACE THE PHILOSOPHER OF LIFE

BY GRANT SHOWERMAN  
University of Wisconsin

### I

A great source of the richness of personality which constitutes Horace's chief appeal lies in his contemplative disposition. His attitude toward the universal drama is that of the onlooker. He is not without vivid interests in the piece, as we shall see; but his principal mood is one of mild amusement. He has, in time past, assumed several of the rôles himself, he has known personally a great many of the actors, and he is perfectly well aware that there is a great deal of the mask and buskin, and that each man in his time plays many parts. Experience has begotten reflection, and reflection has contributed to experience, until contemplation has passed from amusement to habit.

Except that his "meddling with any practical part in life" has not been so slight, Horace is another Spectator: "Thus I live in the world rather as a Spectator of mankind than as one of the species, by which means I have made myself a speculative statesman, soldier, merchant, and artisan, without ever meddling with any practical part in life. I am very well versed in the theory of a husband, or a father, and can discern the errors in the economy, business, and diversion of others, better than those who are engaged in them: as standers-by discover blots which are apt to escape those who are in the game." He looks down with as clear vision as a Lucretius, whom he admires:

*Sed nil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere  
Edita doctrinae sapientum templa serena,  
Despicere unde queas alios passimque videre  
Errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae,  
Certare ingenio, contendere nobilitate  
Noctes atque dies niti praestante labore  
Ad summos emergere opes rerumque potiri.*

And Horace is not only a stander-by contemplating the game in which objective mankind is engaged; he is also a spectator of himself. Horace the poet-philosopher contemplates Horace the man with the same quiet amusement with which he looks down upon the human society of which he is an inseparable yet detachable part. It is the universal aspect of Horace which is the object of his contemplation—Horace playing a part together with the rest of mankind in the infinitely diverting *comédie humaine*. He uses himself for illustrative purposes, so to speak—to point the moral of the genuine; to demonstrate the indispensability of hard work as well as genius; to afford concrete proof of the possibility of happiness without wealth. He is almost as objective to himself as the landscape of the Sabine farm. Horace the spectator sees Horace the man against the background of human life just as he sees snow-mantled Soracte, or the Digentia—

Infirmo capiti fluit utilis, utilis alvo—

or the restless Adriatic—

Dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae—

or leafy Tarentum, or snowy Algidus, or green Venafrum.

The clear-cut elegance of his miniatures of Italian scenery is not due to their individual interest, but to their connection with the universal life of man. Description for its own sake is scarcely to be found in Horace; and in the same way, the vivid glimpses he affords of his own life, person, and character almost never prompt the thought of egotism. The most personal of poets, his expression of self is nowhere selfish expression.

But there are spectators who are mere spectators. Horace is more. He is an interpreter and a critic. He looks forth upon life with a keen vision for comparative values, and gives sane and distinct expression to what he sees.

He is no carping critic, however. His attitude is judicial, but the verdict is rarely other than lenient and kindly. Horace is no wasp of Twickenham, no Juvenal laying about him savagely with a club, no Lucilius with Scipionic axes to grind, having at the leaders of the people and the people themselves, tribe by tribe.

He is also not an Ennius, serving the *lanx satura* merely to

gratify the taste for entertainment. There *are* those to whom in satire he seems to go beyond the limit. At vice in pronounced form, at all forms of unmanliness, he does indeed strike out, like his predecessor and pattern, the knight of Campania:

Scilicet uni aequus virtuti atque eius amicis.

But those whose hearts are pure and whose hands are clean need fear nothing; and even those who are guilty of the ordinary frailties of human kind need fear nothing worse than being good-naturedly laughed at. The objects of his smiling condemnation are not the trifling faults of the individual or the class, but the universal stupidities which poison the sources of life.

The Horace of the satires and epistles is better called an essayist. That he is a satirist at all is less by virtue of intention than of the mere fact that he is a spectator. To look upon life with the eye of understanding is to see men the prey to delusions and passions the mere comment upon which constitutes satire.

## II

What is it that Horace sees as he sits apart upon his philosophic hill retired, and what are his reflections? The great factor in the personality of Horace is his philosophy of life; to define it is to give the meaning of the term "Horatian" as far as content is concerned, and to trace the thread which more than any other unifies his work.

### I

Horace looks forth upon a world of discontented and restless humanity. The soldier, the lawyer, the farmer, the trader, swept over the earth in the passion for gain like dust in the whirlwind—choose any one you will—all are dissatisfied:

Quemvis media elige turba,

Aut ob avaritiam aut misera ambitione laborat.

Some are dazzled by silver, others lose their senses over bronze; some are ever reaching after political prizes; many are insane with love; most are engaged in a mad race for money, whether to assure themselves of retirement and ease in old age, or out of mere desire to outstrip their rivals in the course—

Quot capitum vivunt, totidem studiorum  
Milia.

And over and about all men, by reason of their bondage to avarice, ambition, and passion, hovers Black Care: flitting above their sleepless eyes in the paneled ceiling of the darkened palace, sitting behind them on the courser as they rush into battle, dogging them as they enjoy the pleasures of the bronze-trimmed yacht—pursuing them everywhere, swifter than the deer, swifter than the wind that drives on the storm-cloud. Not even those who are most happy are wholly so, for perfect happiness is unattainable—

*Nihil est ab omni*

*Parte beatum;*

Tithonus wasted away in undying old age, Achilles had to perish in youth. Not even the richest are satisfied: there is always something lacking even in their abundance, and desire more than keeps pace with satisfaction—

*Crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam*

*Maiorumque fames . . .*

*Curtae nescio quid semper abest rei.*

Nor are the multitude less enslaved to their wants than the few: Glory drags bound to her glittering chariot wheels the nameless as well as the nobly born; the poor are as inconstant as the rich—

*Quid pauper? Ride: mutat cenacula, lectos,*

*Balnea, tonsores, conducto navigio aequae*

*Nauseat ac locuples quem ducit priva triremis.*

And not only are all men the victims of insatiable desire, but all are subject to the uncertainties of fate. Insolent Fortune shakes her swift wings and leaves them; friends are faithless, once the cask is drained to the lees. Death, unexpected and unforeseen, lurks in ambush for them in a thousand places: some are swallowed up by the greedy sea; some the Furies give to destruction in the grim spectacle of war;

*Mixta senum ac iuvenum densentur funera, nullum*

*Saeva caput Proserpina fugit.*

Even those who for the time escape the object of their dread must at last face the inevitable. Invoked and not invoked, Death comes to release the poor from toil, and to strip the proud of power. The same night awaits all; everyone must tread once for all the path of death. The summons is delivered impartially at the hovels of the poor and the turreted palaces of the rich; the dark stream

must be crossed by prince and peasant alike; eternal exile is the lot of all, whether nameless and poor, or sprung of the line of Inachus—

Adown the wandering stream we all must go,  
Adown Cocytus' waters, black and slow;  
The ill-famed race of Danaüs all must see,  
And Sisyphus, from labor never free.

Nor is there a beyond filled with brightness for the victim of mortal fate to look to. Orcus is un pitying; Mercury's flock is of sable hue, and Proserpina's hue is of the dusk. Black Care clings to poor souls even beyond the grave, dull and persistent, the only substantial feature of the insubstantial world of shades. Sappho still sighs there for love of her maidens, the plectrum of Alcaeus sounds accompaniment only to songs of earthly hardships on land and sea, Prometheus and Tantalus find no surcease from the pangs of torture, the Danaids and Sisyphus are never at rest.

## 2

And yet, let no one hasten to conclude that this is the philosophy of a pessimist. The tone of Horace is neither that of the cheerless skeptic nor that of the despairing philosopher. He does not rise from his contemplation with the conclusion of a Lucretius:

O miseras hominum mentes, O pectora caeca!  
Qualibus in tenebris vitae quantisque periculis  
Degitur hoc aevi quodcumquest!

He may agree with the pessimistic philosophy that life contains pain and striving, but he never shares in the gloom of a Schopenhauer, who in all will sees action, in all action want, in all want pain, who regards pain the essential condition of will, and sees no end of suffering except in the surrender of the will to live. The vanity of human wishes is no secret to Horace, but life is to him no "soap-bubble which we blow out as long and as large as possible, though each of us knows perfectly well it must sooner or later burst."

No, life may have its inevitable end, but it is far more substantial in its composition than a soap-bubble. It contains solid goods in abundance for those who possess the secret of enjoying them.

And what is the secret?

The first step toward enjoyment of the human lot is the general attitude of acquiescence:

Ut melius quicquid erit pati!

Of course existence has its evils and its bitter end; but all these are minimized for the man who faces them frankly, and recognizes the futility of struggling against the fact:

Durum: sed levius fit patientia  
Quicquid corrigere est nefas!

And, once a man yields, and ceases to look upon perfect happiness as a possibility, or upon *any* measure of happiness as a right to be demanded by him, he is in position to take the second step—to make wise use of the advantages of life.

Inter spem curamque, timores inter et iras,  
Omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum:  
Grata superveniet quae non sperabitur hora.

For there *are* many things to make life pleasant. There is the solace of literature and song—

Minuentur atrae  
Carmine curae—

there are the riches of philosophy, the diversion of moving among men, the delights of the country and the city, and, above all, there are friends with whom to share all the physical joy of mere living in Italy. For what purpose the rose, the pine, and the poplar, the gushing fountain, the generous wine of Formian hill and Massic slope, the villa by the Tiber, the peaceful and healthful seclusion of the Sabines, the pleasing change from the sharp winter to the soft zephyrs of spring, *pomifer autumnus*—

Season of mists and mellow fruitfulness—

if not to enjoy? What need to be unhappy in the midst of such a world?

And not only will the wise man recognize the abounding possibilities about him, but will seize upon them before they vanish.

Dona praesentis cape laetus horae!

Who knows whether the gods above will add a tomorrow to the today?

Carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero!

Seek not to pierce the morrow's haze,  
But for the moment render praise;  
Nor spurn the dance, nor love's sweet passion,  
Ere age draws on with its joyless days.

The goods of existence must be enjoyed here and now, or never.

All must be left—lands, home, beloved wife—  
All left behind when we have done with life;  
One tree alone, of all thou holdest dear,  
Shall follow thee—the cypress—on thy bier!

What is once enjoyed is forever your very own. Happy the man who can say, at each day's close: "I have lived!" The day is his: let Jove overcast with black cloud the morrow's heaven, or illuminate it with clear sunshine—as he pleases; what the flying hour has taken with it he can never recall. Life is a stream, now gliding peacefully onward in mid channel to the Tuscan sea, now rolling along on its swirling bosom the wreckage of flood and storm. The pitiful human being on its banks who ever looks with greedy expectation up the stream, or with vain regret downstream, is left at last with nothing at all. The part of wisdom and happiness is to keep eyes on that part of the stream directly before you—the only part which may be seen.

Waste not your Hour, nor in the vain pursuit  
Of This and That endeavor and dispute;  
Better be jocund with the fruitful Grape  
Than sadden after none, or bitter, Fruit.

Ah! fill the Cup: What boots it to repeat  
How Time is slipping underneath our Feet:  
Unborn TOMORROW, and dead YESTERDAY,  
Why fret about them if TODAY be sweet!

3

But Horace's Epicureanism does not go the length of Omar's. He would have shrunk from the philosophy of the Persian as extreme:

YESTERDAY *This* Day's Madness did prepare;  
TOMORROW's Silence, Triumph, or Despair;  
Drink! for you know not whence you came, nor why:  
Drink! for you know not why you go, nor where.

Horace's Epicureanism is more nearly that of Epicurus himself, the saintly recluse who taught that "to whom little is not enough, nothing is enough," and regarded plain living as at the same time a duty and a happiness. With degenerate Epicureans, whose philosophy led them

To roll with pleasure in a sensual sty,

he had little in common. The extraction from life of the honey of enjoyment was indeed the highest aim; but the aim could never be realized without the exercise of moderation, discrimination, and the attainment of a measure of spiritual culture. Life was an art—unified, symmetrical, reposeful—like the poem of perfect art, or the statue, or the temple. In actual conduct, the hedonist of the Aristippan or Epicurean type was little different from the Stoic himself.

The gracious touch and quiet humor with which Horace treats even the most serious themes are often misleading to the sober Anglo-Saxon reader; and this effect is the more possible by reason of the presence among his works of a scattering of regrettable poems and passages, mostly youthful, in which there is a degree of abandon.

Horace is really a very serious person—even something of a preacher—

Laudator temporis acti  
Se puero, castigatorem minorum.

So far as popular definitions of Stoic and Epicurean are concerned, and so far as actual practice went, he was much more the former than the latter.

For Horace's counsel is always for moderation, and sometimes for austerity. He is no wine-bibber, and he is no total abstainer. To be the latter on principle would never have occurred to him. The vine is the gift of God. Prefer to plant nothing before it in the mellow soil of Tibur, Varus; it is one of the compensations of life:

Its magic power of wit can spread  
The halo round a dullard's head,  
Can make the sage forget his care,  
His bosom's inmost thoughts unbarred,  
And drown his solemn-faced pretense  
Beneath its blithesome influence.  
Bright hope it brings and vigor back  
To minds outworn upon the rack,  
And puts such courage in the brain  
As makes the poor be men again,  
Whom neither tyrant's wrath affrights,  
Nor all their bristling satellites.

When wine is a curse, it is not so because of itself, but because of excess in the use of it. The wine-cup was made for purposes of pleasure; but to quarrel over it—out upon such a use! Leave that to barbarians from the North! Take warning by the Thracians, and the Centaurs and Lapithae, and do not overstep the bounds of moderation. Pleasure with bitterness in its train is not real pleasure:

Sperne voluptates; nocet empta dolore voluptas.

Upon women Horace looks with the same philosophic calm as upon wine. Love, too, was to be regarded as one of the contributions to life's enjoyment. His relations with golden-haired Pyrrha, with Lyce, or with Glycera, the beauty more resplendent than Parian marble, were in his eyes proper in themselves. What he felt no hesitation in committing to his poems for his friends and the emperor to read, they felt no hesitation in confessing to him. The fault of love lay not in itself, but in its abuse—or in disturbance of the institution of marriage.

There is no inconsistency in the Horace of the erotic odes and satires and the Horace of the *Carmen Saeculare* who petitions Juno Lucina to prosper the decrees of the senate encouraging the marriage relation and the rearing of families. Of the only illicit love—that which looked upon married women to lust after them—he declares his innocence with emphasis, and against it directs the last and most powerful of the six inaugural odes; for this touched the family and through the family the state. Horace classes it and religious neglect as the two great causes of national misfortune.

Horace is no Ovid. He is not even a Catullus. He was guilty of no breach of the morals of his own time, and it is likely that he was also guiltless of excess. The flame never really burned him; we may search his pages to no purpose for evidences of a real and absorbing passion, either carnal or spiritual. He was a bona fide supporter of the emperor in his attempts at the moral improvement of the state. If Virgil in the writing of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* was conscious of a purpose to second the projects of Augustus, it is just as likely that his intimate friend Horace also

wrote with conscious moral intent. What more in keeping with his conception of the end and effect of literature—

Os tenerum pueri balbumque figurat,  
Torquet ab obscaenis iam nunc sermonibus aurem,  
Mox etiam pectus praeceptis format amicis,  
Asperitatis et invidiae corrector et irae,  
Recte facta refert, orientia tempora notis  
Instruit exemplis, inopem solatur et aegrum.

## 4

Horace's philosophy of life is thus based upon something more than the principle of seizing upon pleasure. His definition of pleasure is not without austerity, and he preaches the positive virtues of performance as well as the negative virtue of moderation, a stern guardian and rigid satellite of real virtue—

Virtutis verae custos rigidusque satelles—

who counsels the bending of self to circumstance rather than the bending of circumstance to self.

Horace stands for domestic purity, and he stands for patriotic devotion:

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.

His hero is Regulus, returning steadfastly through the ranks of expostulating friends to keep faith with the Carthaginian tormentors; him, and the Scauri, and Paullus, who poured out his great spirit at Cannae, and Fabricius, he holds up as examples to his own generation. In praise of the sturdy Roman virtues of courage and steadfastness he writes some of his most inspired lines:

Iustum et tenacem propositi virum  
Non civium ardor prava iubentium,  
Non vultus instantis tyranni  
Mente quatit solida neque Auster,

Dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,  
Nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis:  
Si fractus illabatur orbis,  
Impavidum ferient ruinae.

He preaches the gospel of faithfulness not only to family, country, and purpose, but to religion; he will avoid contact with the man who violates the secrets of the mystic: the curse of the gods is on all such, and pursues them to the day of doom. Faithfulness

in friendship stands out no less. While Horace is in his right mind, he will compare nothing to the delights of friendship:

*Nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico!*

He is ready to enter upon the last journey with Maecenas whenever fate calls. Among the happy of mortals is he who is unafraid to die for dear friends or country:

*Non ille pro caris amicis  
Aut patria timidus perire!*

Honor, too—the fine spirit of old Roman times, that refused bribes, that would not even take advantage of an enemy's weakness, that asked no questions save what was right, and never turned its back upon duty, that swore to its own hurt and changed not—the same lofty spirit the recording of whose manifestations never fails to bring the glow of admiration to Livy's cheek—is first and foremost in Horace's esteem also. Regulus, Curius, refusing the Samnite gold, Camillus, yielding up private grievances to come to the rescue of the city, Cato, dying for his convictions after Thapsus, are his inspirations. His ideal fears disgrace worse than death—

*Peiusque leto flagitium timet.*

The diadem and the laurel are for him only who can pass on without casting the glance back on heaps of treasure.

And not least among the qualities which make up the ideal of Horace is the simplicity of the olden time, when the armies of Rome were made up of citizen-soldiers, and the eye of every Roman was single to the glory of the state, and the selfishness of luxury was yet unknown:

*Privatus illis census erat brevis,  
Commune magnum: nulla decempedis  
Metata privatis opacam  
Porticus excipiebat arcton,*

*Nec fortuitum spernere caespitem  
Leges sinebant, oppida publico  
Sumptu iubentes et deorum  
Templa novo decorare saxo.*

The healthful repose of heart which comes from unity of purpose and simple devotion to plain duty he sees still existing, even in his own less strenuous age, in the remote and peaceful countryside—

Beatus ille qui procul negotiis—

and he covets the gift earnestly for himself, because his calm vision sees that it of all the virtues lies next to happy living.

## 5

Here we have arrived at the essential feature of Horace's philosophy of life. In actual life, at least, mankind storm the citadels of happiness—as if it were something external, to be taken by violent hands. Horace locates the citadel of happiness in his own breast. Keep thine heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life. It is the heart which is the source of all joy and all sorrow, of all wealth and all poverty. Happiness is to be sought not outside, but inside. Man does not create his world: he *is* his world.

Men are madly chasing after peace of heart in a thousand wrong ways, all the while overlooking the right one, which is nearest at hand. To observe their feverish eagerness, one might be led to think happiness identical with wealth. And yet wealth and happiness are neither the same nor equivalent. They may have nothing to do with each other. Money, indeed, is not wrong in itself, but it is not essential except as a mere means to life. Poor men may be happy, and the wealthy may be poor—

Magnas inter opes inops.

A man's wealth consisteth not in the abundance of the things he possesseth.

Non possidentem multa vocaveris  
Recte beatum; rectius occupat  
Nomen beati qui deorum  
Muneribus sapienter uti

Duramque callet pauperiem pati,  
Peiusque leto flagitium timet,  
Non ille pro caris amicis  
Aut patria timidus perire.

Real happiness consists in peace of mind and heart. Everyone desires it, and prays for it—the sailor caught in the stormy Aegean, the furious Thracian, the Mede with quiver at his back. But it is purchasable neither with gems or purple or gold, nor by preferment:

Non enim gazae neque consularis  
Submovet lictor miseros tumultus  
Mentis et curas laqueata circum  
Tecta volantis.

Nor is it to be pursued and taken, or discovered in some other clime. Of what avail to fly to lands warmed by other suns? What exile ever escaped himself?

In culpa est animus, qui se non effugit umquam.

The sky is all he changes:

Caelum, non animum, mutant qui trans mare currunt.

The happiness men seek for is in themselves, to be found at little Ulubrae as easily as in the cities of the gorgeous East, if only they have the proper attitude of heart—

Quod petis hic est,  
Est Ulubris, animus si te non deficit aequus.

But how insure oneself this peace of mind? In the first place, the searcher after happiness will recognize that unhappiness is the result of slavery of some sort, and that slavery is begotten of desire. The man who is overfond of anything will be unwilling to give it up. The only safety lies in refusing the rein to passion:

Nil admirari prope res est una, Numici,  
Solaque quae possit facere et servare beatum.

He who lives either in desire or in fear is incapable of enjoying what he possesses. He who desires, will fear also; and he who fears can never be a free man. The wise man will not allow his desires to become his tyrants. Money will be his servant, not his master. He will attain to wealth by curbing his wants:

Latius regnes avidum domando  
Spiritus quam si Libyam remotis  
Gadibus iungas et uterque Poenus  
Serviat uni.

The poor man may enjoy life more than the rich, in spite of his poverty. It is possible under the roof of the poor to outstrip in happiness kings and the friends of kings. For wealth depends upon what men want, not upon what they have. The more a man denies himself, the greater are the gifts of the gods to him. One may hold riches in contempt, and be a more splendid lord

of wealth by doing so than the great landowner of Apulia. By contracting his desires he may extend his revenues until they are more than those of the gorgeous East. Many wants attend those who have many ambitions. Happy the man to whom God has given barely enough:

Contracto melius parva cupidine  
Vectigalia porrigam  
Quam si Mygdoniis regnum Alyattei  
Campis continuem. Multa petentibus  
Desunt multa: bene est cui deus obtulit  
Parca quod satis est manu.

Let him to whom fate, fortune, or his own effort has given enough desire no more: should the liquid stream of Fortune gild him, it would make his happiness no greater, for money cannot change his nature.

Quod satis est cui contingit, nil amplius optet.  
Non domus et fundus, non aeris acervus et auri  
Aegroto domini deduxit corpore febris,  
Non animo curas: valeat possessor oportet,  
Si comportatis rebus bene cogitat uti.

To the man who has good digestion and good lungs and is free from the gout, the riches of a king can add nothing. What difference does it make to him who lives within the limits of nature whether he plows a hundred acres or a thousand?

As with the passion of greed, so with anger, love, ambition for office, and all the other forms of desire which lodge in the human heart. Make them your slaves, or they will make you theirs. Like wrath, they are all forms of madness:

Ira furor brevis est; animum rege; qui nisi paret,  
Imperat: hunc frenis, hunc tu compesce catena.

The avaricious man has thrown away the armour of life—

Perdidit arma, locum virtutis deseruit, qui  
Semper in augenda festinat et obruitur re.

He who once submits to the domination of desire of any unworthy kind will find himself in the case of the horse that called in man to help him drive out the stag from their common feeding-ground, and received the bit and rein forever.

So Horace will enter into no entangling alliances with financial, political, or social ambitions, or with the more personal passions. He has not been altogether untouched by some of them, and he has no regret; but to continue, at forty-five, would not do—

*Nec luisse pudet, sed non incidere ludum.*

He is content with his home in the Sabines—

*Satis beatus unicus Sabinis.*

This is what he always prayed for—a patch of ground, not so very large, with a spring of ever-flowing water, a garden, and a little timber land above. He asks for nothing more, except that a kindly fate will make these beloved possessions forever his own. He will go to the ant (*nam exemplo est*), and consider her ways and be wise, and be content with what he has as soon as it is enough. He will not enter the field of public life because it would mean the sacrifice of his peace: he would have to keep open house, submit to the attentions of a body-guard of servants, keep horses and a carriage and coachman, be the target for shafts of malice and envy—in a word, lose his freedom—

*Vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique.*

The price is too great, the privilege none to his liking. His prayer is rather to be free from the cares of empty ambition, from the fear of death and the passion of anger, to laugh at superstition, to enjoy the happy return of his birthday, to be forgiving of his friends, to grow more gentle and better as old age draws on, to recognize the proper limit in all things:

Health to enjoy the blessings sent

From heaven; a mind unclouded, strong;

A cheerful heart; a wise content;

An honored age; and song.

## THE CHRONOLOGY OF SALLUST'S *JUGURTHA*

BY H. V. CANTER  
The University of Illinois

Sound criticism has for long recognized that, while historical composition is today regarded as a science, the antique writer considered it a rhetorical art; that a difference in the latter's aim and emphasis explains the omission in his work of much that is ordinarily demanded by a modern reader, trained to expect a scientific rather than a rhetorical presentation of facts. A disregard of this guiding principle, however, as by Ihne (*Hist. of Rome*, Book VII, chap. viii), brings unjust censure on Sallust's monograph, alike for what it does, and does not contain. Judged as a military chronicle, the *Jugurtha* is, of course, disappointing. But Sallust did not aspire to completeness and accuracy in military details, to geographical precision, and to definite dates. In his departure from the annalistic method, he so far neglects matters of chronology that about the only data for the determination of dates are to be found in the names of the consular commanders.

Unfortunately the few notices of the war with Jugurtha found in other authors (Livy, *Epit.* 62, 64-67; Plutarch, *Marius*; Oros. v. 15; Vell. ii. 11; Florus iii. 1; Appian, *Foreign Wars*, Book VIII, Part 2) are disconnected, and of little value in getting at the sequence of events. And if we accept Sallust's account as written there remains an entire year of the war not covered by his narrative. In this, however, there can be no objection as to the earlier years—the fall of Cirta (112 B.C.), Rome's declaration of war in 112 or early in 111, the campaigns of 111-108 B.C. In the year 107, the fifth of the war, we have Marius' first campaign, and in the spring of 106 his second campaign closes with the capture of Jugurtha. Sallust continues (chap. 114):

Per idem tempus advorsum Gallos ab ducibus nostris Q. Caepione et Cn. Manlio male pugnatum. . . . Sed postquam bellum in Numidia confectum et Iugurtham Romam victum adduci nuntiatum est, Marius consul absens factus est . . . isque Kalendis Ianuariis magna gloria consul triumphavit.

Thus Sallust makes the capture of Jugurtha coincident with the Roman defeat by the Cimbri at Arausio, a disaster which took place (Livy, *Epit.* 67; Plutarch, *Lucullus* 27) October, 105, or a year later than given by Sallust. Nevertheless, Sallust's date for the capture of Jugurtha and the close of the war was for many years accepted without question, and stands today without correction or modification in many textbooks on Roman history, e.g., those by Duruy, Shuckburgh, Merivale, and others. Further, Marius' second consulship and triumph belong, not to the year 105, as inferred from Sallust's account, but to the year 104.

Mommsen (*Röm. Gesch.* II, 146) was the first to point out the inconsistency of Sallust's dates. To remove the difficulty he defers the campaigns of Metellus (years 109 and 108, according to Sallust) to the years 108 and 107, on the grounds that his late arrival in Africa and the reorganization of a demoralized army prevented him from beginning operations until the year following his arrival. Likewise, Marius' campaigns (years 107 and 106) are shifted to the years 106 and 105. Thus the capture of Jugurtha and the end of the war are made to agree in time with the defeat of the Romans by the Cimbri, as stated by Sallust. Pelham ([Eng.] *Jour. of Phil.* II, 91) discovers in Mommsen's arrangement objections as serious as those which lie against Sallust's own version. First, it supposes that Marius, as Metellus' lieutenant, spent the last six months of 108 in Numidia, at which time we are forced from the narrative and Plutarch (*Marius* 7 and 8) to believe he was in Rome. Secondly, after Marius (summer of 108, according to Sallust) was allowed to go to Rome, Metellus enters on his second campaign. But just as soon as he heard of Marius' appointment as his successor, he relaxed all activity, i.e., late in 107, if, with Mommsen, this is taken as the year of Metellus' second campaign. But Marius' election occurred in the autumn of 108, and it is difficult to believe that the news was a year late in reaching Metellus. Pelham (*op. cit.*) makes a suggestion which he himself, however, regards as unsatisfactory. Accepting Sallust's date for Jugurtha's capture as 106, he supposes that Marius was detained in Africa until the middle of 105; that he then announced his purpose of bringing Jugurtha to Rome, and was elected consul in view of the threatened

Cimbric invasion; that he returned to Italy late in the year 105, and celebrated his triumph January 1, 104. But this view assumes that Sallust is wrong in making Caepio's defeat coincide with Jugurtha's capture rather than with the news of Marius' coming to Rome. Besides, Pelham can advance no good reason for Marius' long stay in Numidia, as it was not reorganized into a Roman province.

It is proposed here, after indicating further obstacles to Mommsen's conclusions, and the impossibility of the chronology worked out by Greenidge (*Hist. of Rome*, Vol. I), who has last spoken on the subject, to outline a third arrangement of Sallust's dates, which agrees in the main with Ihne's view, and seems free from any invalidating objections. There is no sufficient reason for concluding with Mommsen that Metellus' first campaign did not occur in the year 109, the events of which are told by Sallust, chaps. 43-61.2. Sallust's elaborate word-picture of the demoralization of Albinus' army and Metellus' efforts to restore discipline, Mommsen took far too seriously. The narrative contains nothing to show that these matters took a long time. On the contrary Sallust represents Metellus as a man of energy and dispatch (43.2); he says specifically (45.3) that he soon had the army under control; that when it entered Numidia it was alert and full of fight (46.5). Hence, in the part of the summer which remained after Metellus' arrival in Africa until he went into winter-quarters (62.2), there was ample time to complete the events mentioned by Sallust—the occupation of Vaga (47), the battle of the Muthul (47.3-54), the siege of Zama (57-61). Since the identification of the river Muthul by Tissot (cf. Greenidge, *op. cit.*, p. 390, note) it is clear that all of Metellus' movements during this period were concentrated in S.E. Numidia, and not, as formerly believed, shifted from the eastern part westward toward Hippo Regius, thence back to Zama. Nor is there anything in Sallust's account which indicates that the campaign of 109 closes with the battle of the Muthul, as stated by Greenidge, p. 401: "Neither the movements which followed the battle of the Muthul nor the site of the winter-quarters into which Metellus led his men have been recorded." However, Sallust's record of the movements of both Metellus and

Jugurtha at this juncture is quite clear, and there is no cessation of hostilities until we reach 61.2, where it is said of Metellus: "exercitum in provinciam, quae proxima est Numidiae, hiemandi gratia locat." While thus encamped Metellus intrigues with Bomilcar, following which we learn (62.10) that Metellus' command in Numidia had been prolonged by a decree of the senate.

The events of Metellus' second campaign (108) begin properly with the revolt (66.2), recapture, and punishment (68-69) of the people of Vaga, and continue until the march of Jugurtha and Bocchus on Cirta (81), which city, in some way not told by Sallust, was now in Metellus' hands (82). Hereupon, Metellus, chagrined at hearing that Marius was to supersede him (82.2), allowed the year to come to an inactive close (83.3). Greenidge, however, makes the year 108 close with the capture of Vaga, and ascribes a third campaign to Metellus in the year 107, taken up with events told by Sallust 73-83.3. The basis for such an arrangement is 73.1: "igitur Metellus . . . rursus tamquam ad integrum bellum cuncta parat festinatque." But clearly these words warrant no such interpretation as Greenidge gives. They merely mean that after Metellus' failure to ensnare Jugurtha, he again turns to the war, which was now just as far from finished (*integrum*) as before Bomilcar's conspiracy began. Further, in the next sentence we are told that Marius is allowed to return to Rome. According to Plutarch (*Marius* 8) he left Africa only twelve days before the consular elections. From Sallust's account it appears that Marius left early in the year 108, since the only incident recorded between the recapture of Vaga (winter 109-108; cf. 68.2), at which Marius was present (so Plutarch), and his departure is the conspiracy of Bomilcar. But whether we accept the version of Sallust or of Plutarch, the time which we are forced from Greenidge's dates to set for Marius' leaving is inconsistent with the time of his election at Rome, late summer or autumn of 108. Even Greenidge, following Meinel (*Zur Chronologie des Jugurth. Kriegen*), puts Marius' election in the winter of 108, or early the next year. It seems clear, therefore, that the events of chap. 73 belong still to the year 108. Finally, a serious objection to Greenidge's assignment of a third campaign to Metellus is that it makes his command in

Africa for the year 107 concurrent with Marius' exercise of the same function at Rome. Under what authority does Metellus retain command in Africa for this year? Not the prolongation of his tenure by the senate (73.7), for this defective passage Greenidge properly rejects as an interpolation from chap. 62, as does Mommsen. Did Marius voluntarily yield or delegate authority to Metellus? Even if we grant the possibility of such a thing, Sallust says nothing about it.

When did Marius, after his election, reach Africa? Mommsen thinks it was as consul after the campaign of 107 was over, or as proconsul in 106. It will be remembered that Marius' two campaigns (Sallust describes but two) are put by Mommsen in the years 106 and 105. This forces him to account for Marius' inactivity in 107 by supposed detention at Rome in levying troops, etc. That Marius arrived in Africa as late as Mommsen claims is a view accepted by no one else. Nor is it reasonable to form such a conclusion from Sallust's account, which again is a picturesque expansion of a few simple facts. That Marius had little difficulty in raising an army is clear. Indeed there was such a desire of accompanying him that he departed with a levy larger than that decreed to him (86.4). The events that fall in this year begin with 86.4, and the first indication of time is in 90.1 ("aetatis extremum erat"), where preparations are being made for the capture of Capsa. This city via Sicca—the route followed—was some 300 miles from Cirta, where Marius took over the army. Meanwhile Marius had spent some months in laying waste Jugurtha's country, in reconnoitering, and in fighting sharp battles (87.1; 88.2), and finally in routing the king near Cirta (88.3). Hence, to accomplish all of this and to destroy Capsa (91.6) by the end of summer, Marius must have reached Numidia early in the year 107. And after the fall of Capsa the part of the campaign remaining was just about sufficient for the reduction of other towns in southeast Numidia, told of by Sallust 92.3. Suddenly (92.5) the scene of Marius' operations shifts some 800 miles, from southeast to extreme northwest Numidia, to attack Jugurtha's treasure-fortress on the river Muluccha. Where then did Marius spend the winter of 107? No event for time determination is given until

97.3, in which we hear that Marius returning to Cirta for winter-quarters was attacked by the combined forces of Jugurtha and Bocchus. Ihne has shown that this cannot refer to the winter of 107; that it was clearly impossible to cover the enormous distance and accomplish so much in the part of the year left after the capture of Capsa. Hence, he concludes that the winter of 107 was spent at Cirta, and that the expedition to the Muluccha did not begin until the spring of 106. It seems evident then that Sallust has included in the campaign of 107 operations that cover 106 as well; that the latter year was taken up entirely with the march to the Muluccha, the return to Cirta, the two battles fought on the way (97.3; 100), and possibly with a third (cf. *Oros.* v. 15.9). Sallust's confusion of two distinct years thus accounts for the year not covered by his narrative; it removes also the discrepancy of a year between Jugurtha's capture and the events of chap. 114. The remainder of Sallust's account presents no difficulty. The negotiations with Bocchus begin five days after Marius retires to the winter-quarters of 106 (102.2). Then follow the events of the year 105, beginning with chap. 103 and concluding with the capture of Jugurtha (113.6). The preceding discussion will gain in clearness by the following outline: First year (111 B.C.): L. Calpurnius Bestia in command (chaps. 27-34). Second year (110 B.C.): Sp. and Aul. Albinus in command (chaps. 35-36). Third year (109): under the command of Aul. Albinus (37-39.5); Sp. Albinus (39.5-43); Metellus (43-61.2). Fourth year (108): Metellus (62.10-83). Fifth year (107): Marius' first year in command (84-91). Sixth year (106): Marius' second year in command (92.5-100). Seventh year (105): Marius' third year in command (103-114).

The prolongation of Marius' command for the years 106 and 105 is assumed by this arrangement, as it must be for a year in that proposed by Mommsen, and for two in that by Pelham. That Sallust tells nothing about it, as he did in the case of Metellus (62.10), is not surprising. It has no bearing on the political issues of the Numidian question, with which Sallust was chiefly concerned.

## THE HISTORICAL NOVEL IN THE CLASSROOM

BY FREDERIC STANLEY DUNN  
University of Oregon

Never voluntarily would I seek the office of advocate for either prosecution or defense, much less that of judge or juror, in the arraignment of the historical novel. My own convictions would prove too curious a contradiction, now condoning, but again condemning; my sentence of one day would all too likely be repealed the next. At times, I have thrust aside a would-be historical tale with profound disgust, yet subsequently to revel with complete satisfaction in a masterful and faithful piece of fiction. The types are manifestly too varied, too elusive, to admit of a sweeping predicate in either vindication or disparagement, for the very element to be deplored in one will be a matter of congratulation under another's hand. It is true, historical fiction has not even reformed its palpable faults of long ago—its maturity is in great part charged with the same old errors of its youth. But we may as well be resigned, for, though long since convicted of grave sins, the classical novel has many commendable merits in palliation, and will doubtless remain in unruffled indifference before the bar of literary criticism.

As an instructor in the classics, I must confess to have reaped not merely genuine enjoyment but decided profit from historical fiction. An early hobby of mine, of which I am still a willing devotee, was a systematic reading of novels based upon classic themes. And, that I might secure a real benefit from such a course, I persisted in attacking them, not in haphazard fashion, but in strictly chronological order, even beginning with those that were founded on prehistoric life, such as Jack London's *Before Adam*, or Stanley Waterloo's *The Story of Ab*; then continuing the thread of story down through biblical, Graeco-Roman, and early mediaeval times, establishing, for sobriety's sake, a very fixed *terminus ad quem* with the Norman conquest of England. How much I have owed to this panoramic illumination of history, this veritable "moving picture exhibition," I shall never be able adequately to express.

The Persian Invasion under Xerxes was as vivid as yesterday's rainbow under the fascinating lead of William Davis' *A Victor of Salamis*. Athens' confused record under the Misrule of the Thirty, despite all the Attic orators and historians, became somewhat intelligible to me after Charles K. Gaines's *Gorgo* fell into my hands. The horrors of the Mercenary War will always remain a nightmare to me since reading Flaubert's *Salamambo*. Rome's struggle with Spartacus and the gladiators became intensely real to me under the spell of Eckstein's *Prusias*. Walter S. Cramp's *Psyche* was like a flashlight thrown upon the *Annals* of Tacitus—it seemed to me that I had not hitherto understood many scenes in the narrative of those dark days under Tiberius. I have no hesitation in avowing that even the juveniles of Alfred J. Church and George Henty, with all their very evident defects, have added no little zest to my appreciation of classic history.

Occasionally I have ventured to read in the classroom brief selections from representative classic novels and have never failed to receive from my most mature students a gracious acknowledgment of clearer vision and increased stimulus in the subject which chanced to be under discussion. For example, one of my classes, working on the Latin of the Decadence, became, all incidentally, involved in some confusion over the manner of Pompeius' death, as suggested by Martial's *Epigrams* v.69 and 74. At our next meeting, in addition to the discussion of the *loci classici*, I took occasion also to read in illustration from Davis' *A Friend of Caesar*—the second part of chap. xxii, which he entitles "The End of the Magnus," wherein the tragedy is well portrayed. The classic authorities and their modern rendition were a very successful combination.

A class in Cicero's *Cato Maior* once became interested in the study of the ancient oracle. I recalled the scenes in Gilkes's *Kallistratus*, in which the chicanery of the oracle on the Rhone was most admirably illustrated. Eckstein's *The Chaldaean Magician*, the tale of "An Adventure in Rome in the Reign of the Emperor Diocletian," would, of course, have been too long to read during a single period. But no learned article in any *Realencyclopädie* could have so animated the subject for that class as did those few

pages from *Kalliistratus*, where the Gallic chieftain consults the oracle as to the expediency of espousing the cause of Hannibal or of remaining faithful to Rome.

I well remember the surprise and interest of an advanced class in the teaching of high-school Latin, on my reading to them, without first telling them the source, the first two chapters of Arnold's *Phra the Phoenician*, in which the hero's first experience in his shifting life of metempsychosis is to find himself arrayed with the Britons against Caesar's attacking squadron and subsequently to die beneath the sacrificial adze of the Druidic priests.

Similarly, Pliny's two Letters to Tacitus, narrating the eruption of Vesuvius, suggested the few pages of climax from Lytton's *Last Days of Pompeii*. These are but illustrations of how the classical novel may be taught to yield its best influence educationally. I should recommend, however, that the employment of this practice be rather cautiously and judiciously timed, for too frequent indulgence in it would unquestionably result in dissipation on the part of both instructor and student.

But the very errors of the historical novel have proved a most fertile text for example and correction in the classroom. The inaccuracies in dates, the mistakes in spelling, the anachronisms, the mistranslations, the warped interpretations—all these are a perfect quarry for exercises *in corrigendis*. At times, I have cited passages from various novels, directing my classes to detect and correct such errors as were evident. A "quizz" could very successfully take such a form.

The gross misappropriation of Roman names in fiction is something appalling. I had long ago capitalized the error of Shakespeare in his tragedy of *Julius Caesar*—an error that has itself become a classic—in giving to Decimus Brutus the *nomen* "Decius" in lieu of the *praenomen*. The reduplication of *praenomina* in "Caius Lucius," commander of the Roman forces in the drama of *Cymbeline*, was also known to me. The list of *dramatis personae* in Addison's *Cato* had frequently been called to the attention of my classes—the two sons, Portius and Marcus, dividing between them the father's *nomen* and *praenomen* respectively; the daughter, a Marcia instead of Portia; and a senator denoted by the lonely

*praenomen* Lucius. As the feminine *praenomen* was rather infrequent, the name Lucia, which Addison gives to the senator's daughter, is also worthy of comment.

But I soon learned that the classical novels, both good and bad, were full of erroneous usage in Roman nomenclature. In Elizabeth Miller's *Saul of Tarsus* will be found a scene where the paying teller of a bank is waiting upon a line of customers. Presently he is confronted by a personage applying for a loan, who presents "as an indorsement the favor of Caesar and the *family name of Aulus*." In fact, one of the predominant features running through a host of novels is the overwhelming emphasis laid upon the *praenomen* independently of the other names, forcing it to do duty for the *nomen* and *cognomen*. Marcus and Lucius are the decided favorites and very markedly overworked. *Marcus the Centurion*, the title of a novel of Caesar's time by G. Mannville Fenn; "the Senator Lucius," a character in Gardenhire's *Lux Crucis, a Tale of the Great Apostle*; "the Prefect Publius," the latter in Irving Bacheller's *Virgilius, a Tale of the Coming of Christ*; these are almost as nonsensical as it would be today to call men formally by the given name.

Another abuse of the *praenomen* is its reduplication, as already witnessed from Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*. An instance of this is to be found in Sienkiewicz' *Let Us Follow Him*, a story of the time of Christ, where the very first words are the name "Caius Septimus Cinna." Septimus, after the analogy of Sextus and Decimus, has not classical confirmation.

The multiplication of *nomina*, the first apparently serving the purpose of the *praenomen*, is also a common ruse. While even inordinate accretions of *nomina* became prevalent under the late empire, its instances were too rare during the times of the republic and early principate to warrant such general use made of it in novels based upon early classic periods. Ingraham, in *The Prince of the House of David*, introduces a centurion, "Aemilius Tullius." Henty, in *The Young Carthaginian, a Story of the Times of Hannibal*, has a prominent personage under the name "Julius Marcus."

The greatest blunders, however, occur in the names assigned to women. Few writers of Roman tales seem to have known the

principle that the women of the Republic were quite generally designated by the *inherited nomen*. On the contrary, all sorts of *nomina* are conferred upon the women by heedless authors. Duffield Osborn, on p. 139 of *The Lion's Brood*, makes T. Manlius Torquatus, in the times of the Second Punic War, thus account for his daughter's name: "She is truly Manlia, though called, against custom, for my dead Marcus." Emma Leslie, in *Glaucia, the Greek Slave*, has a "Sempronius Gracchus," in Nero's reign, whose two daughters are respectively "Valeria" and "Claudia." Henty, again, in *The Young Carthaginian*, calls the wife of the Consul Ti. Gracchus by the title "the Lady Flavia Gracchus," somewhat after the modern fashion, while their daughter is styled "Julia."

It has been a source of amusement to note the various appellations given to Pilate's wife in the large group of novels based upon the life of Christ. Some of the writers were apparently ignorant that the Greek church had canonized this "Proselyte of the Gate" under the legendary name of Claudia Procula. Each story taken up in its turn seemed to add a new name to the list. In *The Prince of the House of David*, she is styled "Lucia Metella." In Opie Read's *The Son of the Swordmaker*, she is "Procla," a substantiated form in syncopation. In Henderson's *Diomedes the Centurion*—I may add, in passing, that this last-named volume fairly bristles with all sorts of errors—the name becomes "Clauda"—this also a parallel form. Mark Ashton, in *She Stands Alone*, has the legendary combination, "Claudia Procula." As for Pilate's daughter—if he had one—Mrs. Florence Kingsley, in *Tor, a Street-Boy of Jerusalem*, calls her "Felicia." A little drama by the Very Rev. F. Felix, names her more properly "Pontia," though the same writer countenances still another variant in the mother's name, "Claudia Proclea."

Fictitious names awkwardly derived, or names that may be well enough substantiated but ethnologically misplaced, are especially odious. Malcolm Dearborn, for instance, in his *Bethsaida*, also a story of Christ's time, seems to have tried his ingenuity in manufacturing possibilities. The wife of a "Petronius" is named "Loris," and their son has the Greek name "Aristarchus." "Lionia" and "Delila" appear as Roman matrons in the story. Gar-

denhire's *Lux Crucis* has such names as "Secor Diventus," "Fabyan Amici," "Brabano," and "Paulo," some of which seem to presage the modern Italian.

Anachronisms in the use of well-authenticated proper names, betraying strange lapses in historical accuracy, are particularly startling. An instance may be quoted from *The Young Carthaginian*—"Clotilde," a Gallic girl, and "Brunhilda," chieftainess of the Orcan tribe, are premonitions of the Frankish invasion, still six centuries in the future. The author of *Lux Crucis*, too, perpetrates an anachronism in creating a so-called Briton with the Anglo-Saxon name of "Ethelred"—this in the times of Nero. But, to make the situation still more an impossibility, this Briton is made to hail from Brittany. This last is not the very flagrant confusion of Britain with the French Bretagne, but it is the error of making a Briton come from Bretagne thus early in history, for, in Nero's reign, this section of Gaul was doubtless still known as Armorica, while Brittany, with its immigration of Britons, did not become a historical fact until at least six centuries subsequently. Wholly unconscious of his blurred historical vision, Mr. Gardenhire interpolates this bit of conversation on p. 118. The Senator Lucius remarks to Ethelred:

"In my younger days, I have marched over all Brittany and crossed the channel to the island beyond. Hast been there?"

"To Angle-land of the crooked shores and chalk cliffs?" replied Ethelred, with a smile.

Think of it—Angle-land in the days of Nero! It is we that smile. And, *mirabile dictu*, here in the novel called *Bethsaida*, already noted, is a fisherman named "Nilson," bringing Norraway, the "Ultima Thule," into the Rome of Augustus.

But it is the student in Roman topography who will probably find the classical novel his easiest prey. The crudest errors have been committed in blissful ignorance that there could be any possibility of mistake. The welcome introduction of archaeology into our college curricula has resulted in unfolding a world of knowledge as to things Roman, things which the last generation of writers never suspected. Some citations from *Lux Crucis*, the same tale of Nero's time, will illustrate the *errata* which ignorance of topog-

raphy must needs entail. The author repeatedly makes use of the expression "the Pincius," a designation which the *Collis Hortorum* did not receive until perhaps quite late in the empire. His application of the mediaeval term Mamertine to the Carcer Tullianum is an error of the same type. On p. 198 is the amazing statement, "He . . . drove back *through the Forum of Trajan*"—this in a story of Nero, thirty-three years before the accession of Trajan. A similar anachronism is this on p. 217, "As he turned from the *Via Augusta into the Forum Pacis*," though this misses the synchronism by the mere matter of ten years. Several times, the expression, "Septiminian (*sic*) Way" is used—incorrect not only in word-formation but especially in chronology, for Septimius Severus, after whom only could a *Via Septimiana* be named, did not reign until nearly the close of the second century. Again, on p. 254, someone says, "We can spend an hour there and stop by at the wine-shop *near the Severus Arch*," and on the opposite page is a reference to the "Aelius Bridge." It would be a relief to be able to assign some of these blunders to faulty typography rather than topography, as perhaps this on p. 84: "I became a slave of *Tulla Antonus*, who lived in the *Forum Borianum*," or on p. 285, where the term "Velabrium" is to be found. But the evidence is too overwhelming that the author, while doubtless consulting a map of Rome in good faith, apparently never once surmised that that map was a composite, including also the Rome of the late empire. The *Forum Pacis* might thus escape him, but it is unaccountable how the names Trajan and Septimius Severus at least did not instantly suggest subsequent epochs in history. The repeated use, too, of the term "Transtibertine" looks clumsy beside the accepted *Transtiberine*, a comely twin for "Septiminian."

It seems almost like desecration to discover similar errors lurking amid the chaste diction and the chaster ethics of Walter Pater, yet even *Marius the Epicurean* fell a victim to geographical inaccuracy. Near the close of chap. x is this statement: "It was dark before they reached the *Flaminian Gate*"—this in the times of Marcus Aurelius. Again, in chap. xxv, we find the phrase, "among the low hills on the bank of the Tiber, beyond the *Aurelian Gate*," still antedating the *Aurelian Wall* by many generations.

Even the profound scholarship of Henryk Sienkiewicz was not impregnable against topographical confusion. In perhaps all other respects, *Quo Vadis* is painfully accurate, but when the author presumes to describe the Great Fire of Nero and essays minute geographical references, he betrays his limitation. The progress of the narrative seems to indicate that Sienkiewicz spread a map of Rome before him and implicitly copied the proper names as he pushed his finger along the circuit of the Aurelian Wall. This same confusion of the fourth-century wall with the earlier limits of the city has worked disaster with a number of writers. It forced *Quo Vadis* to bear witness to a multitude of grievous blunders. The Portae Flaminia, Salaria, Nomentana, Appia, Ostiensis, Portuensis, and Septimiana are all severally mentioned as if in existence in Nero's time. As some of these gates involved new roads, the reference to several *viae* too are faulty. For instance, the Via Portuensis, which he repeatedly mentions, may have been an ancient road following the north bank of the river, but it certainly was not the "Harbor Road" until after Trajan began his operations for a new outlet for the Tiber and a new harbor at its mouth. Two references are made to the prehistoric Porta Mugionis of the old Palatine City, as if pertaining to the present city. Finally, the Horti Domitiae are called the "Gardens of Domitian."

Yet at times Sienkiewicz reveals a familiarity with the history of the city's development and seems cognizant of the difference between the Neronian Rome and that of Probus and Honorius. For instance, at the opening of chap. xx is the sentence, "They went through the Vicus Patricius, along the Viminal to the former Viminal Gate, near the plain on which Diocletian afterward built splendid baths"; and again, in chap. xliii, we read, "Besides, the bridge at the Porta Trigenia (*sic*), opposite the Temple of Bona Dea, did not exist yet."

Occasionally a writer exhibits an almost ludicrous inconsistency. M. A. Quinton, the learned author of *The Money God*, a story of Diocletian's time, whose erudition is apparent at every turn, passes immediately from a reference to "the Capena Gate, which terminates the Appian Way," to a paragraph in which he brings his hero across the Tiber to "the great Aurelian Way, ending at the

Aurelian Gate." The Porta Capena and the Porta Aurelia were in two distinct systems of wall. If the so-called Aurelian Wall is to be presumed as now in existence in Diocletian's time, then the Capena Gate as the terminus of the extra-mural portion of the Appian Way is quite out of place, for this gate, as we know, was its terminus in terms of the old Servian Wall.

Citations of errors from numerous volumes could be multiplied *ad infinitum*, but I am unable to resist quoting a few more characteristic ones. Among the curious assertions made by the author of *Diomede the Centurion* is this, that Nero was called Ahenobarbus because of his "bronze beard." It is true, Nero did have at one time a disproportionately famous "bronze beard," but so also, probably, had a long line of Ahenobarbi before him.

In Church's *The Count of the Saxon Shore*, a letter is introduced into the body of the narrative, purporting to come from "Flavius Honorius Augustus to the faithful and valiant Lucius Aelius," and with the following subscription, "Given at Ravenna, the twelfth day before the Kalends of August, in the year of our Lord 408, and the fifteenth year of our reign." The problem here presented is, not the reduction of "a.d.XII.Kal. Aug." (I came near writing "Sex." for this last) to modern terminology, but the realization that "Anno Domini" was still a matter of the future—in fact, it was over a century before Dionysius Exiguus even proposed the instituting of a new chronology, to say nothing of its general adoption by Christendom, which was not until several centuries afterward.

I am convinced that the author of *The Money God* must have been guilty only of grammatical ambiguity in the appended passage, but it is profoundly sensational on the surface. The paragraph in question—and with this I shall close—occurs near the beginning of chap. xvi of Part I and reads, "In confirmation of this" (the cruelty of the Emperors) "is the example of Tarquin the Proud, who, taking the envoys of his son into the garden, cut down the tallest flowers, but took no notice of the low and insignificant ones; thus intimating that humble citizens (unless they were Christians, by whom he always believed himself menaced) caused him no uneasiness, and that he attacked, in Rome, only those whose stature towered above the multitude."

## Notes

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

### "NI MEA CURA RESISTAT" (VIRGIL, *AENEID* II. 599-600)

Quos omnes undique Graiae  
Circum errant acies, et, ni mea cura resistat,  
Iam flammae tulerint, inimicus et hauserit ignis.

A striking parallel, which does not seem to have been noted by editors of the *Aeneid* in their comment on this passage, is Lucretius v. 207. Lucretius has been speaking in his usual strain of the imperfection of the actual world—"tanta stat praedita culpa" (l. 199)—and as evidence of it cites the fact that the greater part of the earth is uninhabitable. Of all that the sky covers, he says, a large part is possessed by mountains and woods, the home of wild beasts, and by the sea. Then two-thirds of what remains is rendered uninhabitable by excessive heat or cold. And,

Quod superest arvi, tamen id natura sua vi  
Sentibus obducit, ni vis humana resistat,

"As to what land is left, even that nature by her own violence would overspread with brambles, should human force fail to resist." That this is a contingency that might very well happen, according to Lucretius' view of things, we know. For, as he believed, "the great globe itself, yea, all which it inherit" were decaying and going toward destruction. Cf. iii. 1173 f.:

Nec tenet omnia paulatim tabescere et ire  
Ad capulum, spatio aetatis defessa vetusto.

In the long period of decline, there naturally would come a time when the *vis humana* would become unequal to the task of resisting the ceaseless encroachment of Nature.

The passage in Virgil is commonly explained in our school editions, wrongly, I think, as a contrary-to-fact condition with present subjunctive for imperfect in the protasis. So the editions of Greenough and Kittredge, Frieze (revised by Dennison), and Harper and Miller. The use of the present for the imperfect subjunctive is explained either as a poetic archaism or as a picturesque use of tenses for the sake of vividness, or indeed as both at once. This last explanation seems to be an attempt to have one's cake and eat it, too. For, if the construction is a poetic archaism, then it is not used for the sake of vividness. At least, in the Plautine examples of this construction there seems

no reason to suppose that the present is consciously substituted for the imperfect for artistic effect, but rather the present subjunctive in such conditions is a survival of an earlier and wider use of that tense. Cf. Hale and Buck, *Latin Grammar*, § 581, d, Remark.

A greater difficulty than that involved in the use of the present subjunctive, *resistat*, in the protasis of the sentence under consideration, is found in the verbs of the apodosis, *tulerint* and *hauserit*. These are regarded by the editors of all the school editions of Virgil that I have at hand, and by Virgilian editors generally, so far as I am aware, as perfect subjunctives. Yet this use of the perfect subjunctive, whether we regard it as an archaism for the pluperfect (Greenough and Kittredge) or as an "instantaneous perfect" (Knapp), can hardly be paralleled. An interesting discussion of this and kindred passages in the *Aeneid* by Dr. Heinrich Blase, one of the editors of the new historical Latin Grammar, may not have come to the attention of many teachers of Virgil, as it was published in a *Gymnasialprogramm* (*Studien und Kritiken zur lateinischen Syntax* von Dr. Heinrich Blase, II. Teil, *Beilage zum Programm des Grossherzoglichen Herbstgymnasiums zu Mainz*, Mainz, 1905, pp. 16 ff.). According to Blase, the starting-point for the interpretation of our sentence should be in the assumption that *tulerint* and *hauserit* are future (perfect) indicatives and not perfect subjunctives. The condition would then become a so-called "mixed" one, corresponding to the type *si sit-erit* (*fuertit*), a type which Blase shows by a careful historical statistic to be a current one in Latin literature from Plautus to the post-classical epoch. The real sense of the condition, Blase thinks, is as follows: "Lass meine Sorge fehlen, so werden die Flammen sie im Augenblick weggerafft haben."

Blase objects to the interpretation of another German scholar, Cauer, according to which Venus in saying *resistat*, rather than *resisteret*, wishes to awaken Aeneas' anxiety (*Angst*) which would have been quieted had she used a form which implied the certainty of her continuing to resist. But this dramatic heightening of the effect is, it seems to me, quite consistent with Blase's own interpretation of the sentence as an ideal, and not an unreal condition.

That it should be so regarded is confirmed by the Lucretian parallel already discussed. The passage in the *De Rerum Natura* was probably before Virgil's mind when he wrote "ni mea cura resistat." The likelihood of this is shown, not only by the resemblance in words and rhythmical position, but also by the fact that Virgil in two places in the *Georgics* seems to have Lucretius' expressions in mind:

*Georgics* i. 197-99:

Vidi lecta diu et multo spectata labore  
Degenerare tamen, ni vis humana quot annis  
Maxuma quaeque manu legeret.

and ii. 411:

Bis segetem densis obducunt sentibus herbae.

*Haurire* in this sense of "devouring flesh" or "drinking blood" is moreover a Lucretian word. Cf. Conington on Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 599 and Lucretius v. 1323.

Three other conditions with present subjunctive in protasis occurring in the first six books of the *Aeneid*, which are generally interpreted as contrary-to-fact conditions, are, I think, better taken as ideal, or "less vivid future" conditions. These are:

*Aen.* i. 58-59:

Ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum  
Quippe ferant rapidi secum verrant que per auras;

v. 325-26:

Spatia et si plura supersint,  
Transeat elapsus prior, ambiguumque relinquat;

and vi. 290-94:

Corripit hic subita trepidus formidine ferrum  
Aeneas, strictamque aciem venientibus offert,  
Et, ni docta comes tenues sine corpore vitas  
Admoneat volitare cava sub imagine formae,  
Inruat, et frustra ferro diverberet umbras.

On the last, Ladewig's interpretation, quoted with approval by Blase (*op. cit.*), may be cited: "Indem der Dichter sich die Lage des Aeneas lebhaft vergegenwärtigt, stellt er es nur als möglich hin, dass Aeneas mit gezogenem Schwerte einen Angriff auf die Gestalten der Unterwelt unternehmen möchte." i. 58-59 is also placed by Blase in the same category with ii. 599 and vi. 292, and though he does not mention the condition in v. 325-26 in this connection, it seems clear that it belongs to the same type. In this sentence *plura* should perhaps be taken not as a comparative, but in its frequent general sense of "many." Though one who knew the end of the race might expect a contrary-to-fact condition, the spectator, from whose point of view the whole passage is written, could not know whether or not there would be sufficiently "many spaces" to enable Dioreas to pass his competitor.

E. FRANCIS CLAFLIN

MONTICELLO SEMINARY  
GODFREY, ILL.

## Current Events

Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Volkmann School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La., for the southern states; and by Frederick C. Eastman, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.

### Massachusetts

*Harvard University.*—At the February meeting of the Harvard Classical Club Dr. James M. Paton of Cambridge read a paper on "Some Western Travelers in Athens in the Middle Ages." On Monday evening, March 6, the Modern Language Conference held a joint meeting with the Classical Club. Professor George L. Kittredge spoke on "Some Queer Tributes to the Classics."

A course on "The Civilization and Art of the Roman, Byzantine, Gothic, and Renaissance Ages," by Professor John O. Sumner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, assisted by members of the staff of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, is announced by the commission on extension courses. The work will consist of two lectures a week by Professor Sumner, and a third hour of practical exercises at the Museum. This course will count toward the new "A.A." degree.

*Classical Association of New England.*—The Eastern Massachusetts section of the association at its recent meeting chose the following officers for 1911-12: *President*, Dr. D. O. S. Lowell, of the Roxbury Latin School; *Secretary*, Clarence W. Gleason, the Volkmann School, Boston; *members of the Executive Committee*, for one year, Professor Donald Cameron, Boston University, for five years, Edward H. Atherton, Girls' Latin School, Boston.

*Dartmouth College.*—Professor John K. Lord of the Latin Department is in Switzerland, on leave of absence for the remainder of the year. Professor Charles D. Adams of the Greek Department will be absent during the next semester.

### Pennsylvania

*University of Pennsylvania.*—The Department of Greek is attempting to arouse public interest in the literature of the ancient Greeks. During February and March a series of readings from the Greek dramatists has been given. A course of lectures upon Greek literature is also being planned by the Greek faculty, to be held in connection with the readings.

**New York**

*Princeton University.*—The Princeton Classical Club in its early years met monthly at the homes of the members or at the Princeton Inn, to enjoy very informally papers of a sufficiently general nature to elicit animated discussion from all present, whether of the Department of Classics or Art and Archaeology. One year there was a reading club alternating with the Classical Club and carried on by faculty and graduate members together, the authors being Sophocles and Plautus. Last year the papers were for the most part rather "streng philologisch" and presented for serious criticism before their publication. This year the meetings have been somewhat irregular, but not oftener than bi-weekly. From the program laid out for this season may be mentioned the following papers: Professor George D. Kellogg on "Plautus' Attitude toward His Greek Originals"; Dr. George Elderkin on "The Pinakothek on the Acropolis"; Mr. Van Hoesen on "The History of the Development of the Roman Cursive"; Professor Thomas H. Goodell of Yale, on "Structural Variety in Greek Tragedy," and a social meeting at the home of Mr. Emerson Howe with an address by Professor John H. Westcott on "Some Ancient Battlefields."

**Ohio**

At the annual convention of the Northeastern Ohio Teachers' Association, which met in Cleveland February 10 and 11, an interesting and enthusiastic session of the Latin Department was held. The program was as follows: "Means for Shortening the Step between First-Year Latin and Caesar," Miss Florence Tuckerman, Rayen High School, Youngstown, Ohio; "What May Reasonably Be Expected of High-School Students in the Cultivation of the Power to Read Latin?" Professor Emma Perkins, College for Women, Cleveland, Ohio; "Is there a Justification of the Position Latin Holds in the High-School Curriculum?" Mr. Charles P. Lynch, superintendent of schools, Lakewood, O. The reading of the papers was followed by a lively informal discussion. It was voted unanimously to request the Association to continue the round-table meetings of the Latin section at its subsequent meetings.

*The Columbus Latin Club* held its winter meeting Saturday evening, February 25. Professor Charles Cole of Oberlin College read an interesting paper on "Sight Translation of Latin." Professor Esther Boise Van Deman, an invited guest, gave an informal talk on the Roman Forum. Miss Van Deman is research associate in archaeology of the Carnegie Institution at Washington. She has been at Rome recently and is soon to return there. At the spring meeting of the club, Professor Elden, of the Ohio State University, is to give an illustrated lecture on some of the Roman excavations in Africa. The club is in a flourishing condition. Its membership is larger than ever before.

**Indiana**

*Greenfield High School.*—In January a Societas Classica was organized by Miss Lena M. Foote, instructor in Latin, with a membership of seventy out

of ninety Latin students. The programs presented fortnightly deal generally with Roman private life. The discussions, given without notes, are illustrated by drawings on the blackboard. Literary selections, such as the "Chariot Race" from *Ben Hur*, or "Spartacus to the Gladiators," are recited when appropriate. The Ides of March will be celebrated with a Caesar program consisting of music, discussions of "Caesar's Life" and "Weapons and Warfare in Caesar's Time," illustrated by models; and the dramatic presentation of *Julius Caesar*, Act III, scenes 1 and 2, by fifteen boys.

#### Kansas

*Baker University.*—The *Frogs* of Aristophanes was recently presented, under the auspices of the Greek department, to a large and appreciative audience. The play was given in English, and was enlivened by replacing some of the more obscure allusions by local hits.

#### Illinois

*The University of Chicago.*—The Classical Club of the University of Chicago is now in its fourteenth year of continuous activity, and can justly claim to be one of the most successful departmental clubs in the University, largely because of the complete informality of its organization and meetings. The members are drawn from the faculty, fellows, and graduate students in the Greek, Latin, and allied departments, and at the meetings, which are held fortnightly, papers are read and discussed, after which refreshments and sociability are in order.

The wide range of the club's activity may be seen from the list of papers presented during the current year: November 1, 1910—R. O. Jolliffe, "Ovid's Method of Borrowing from Vergil"; November 22—Professor C. H. Beeson, "The *Tituli* of Isidore of Seville," and R. M. Jones, "Notes on Norden's Interpretation of *Aeneid* vi"; December 13—Professor H. W. Prescott, "Report on the Latest Publications of Papyri"; January 10, 1911—F. E. Robbins, "The Hexaemera"; January 24—Professor W. G. Hale, "The Harmonizing of Grammatical Nomenclature, with Especial Reference to Mood Syntax," and W. P. Clark, "An Interpretation of a Greek Inscription"; February 7—Professor G. J. Laing, "Some Aspects of Roman Prayer," and Professor C. D. Buck, "A Delphic Inscription"; February 21—Professor F. B. Tarbell, "Roman Portraits"; March 7—G. M. Calhoun, "Athenian Clubs in Litigation."

## Book Reviews

*Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul.* By T. G. TUCKER, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. xix+453. \$2.50.

Those who have read Mr. Tucker's previous work, *Life in Ancient Athens*, will welcome this second volume and, having read it, will not be disappointed. While it shows wide and discriminating scholarship, it makes its appeal frankly to those who have no technical knowledge or training in classical matters. The author makes no pedantic show of learning. There is not a footnote in the book, no citations from foreign languages, no technical terms. Every topic is dealt with in the plainest, and oftentimes in colloquial, English. There is constant comparison with related topics in modern life, so that the reader forgets the great gulf of time and space which actually separates him from the scenes and life which the author is describing. To quote a single instance, in the chapter on holidays and amusements we read:

Our own Sundays and weekly half-holidays make together seventy-eight days, and if we add to these the holidays at Christmas, Easter, and other Bank and public "closings," we shall find that our annual breaks in the working year are not very far from the Roman total, however differently they may be distributed. The difference between us and them lies rather in the way in which the holidays were employed.

We find everywhere a conservative, sane, and sensible view of Roman life. The picture is not taken from the satirist and cynic alone; the alarmist and misrepresenting muck-raker have little place. But from every possible source material has been drawn and presented through the medium of common-sense. The author also insists upon portraying the life of the rank and file of the Roman people as well as that of the nobles who too often occupy the ancient writer's and the modern historian's chief attention.

As the name of the book implies, Roman life and Jewish and Christian history which center around the great apostle are co-ordinated and interwoven, so that the narrative becomes of great value to students of the New Testament and the early church as well as to classical students.

Two plans adopted by Mr. Tucker are of especial value in simplifying and vivifying the narrative. First, he tells his whole story from the standpoint of one date, approximately 64 A.D. We are spared that breathless leaping from period to period which spoils so many narratives. And second, the story is, so far as the actual life of the private citizen is concerned, the description of the daily life in all possible situations of an individual man, not indeed a historical character, but none the less real to us.

Among the twenty-three chapters, all of which are fresh and illuminating, the following may be named as especially interesting and helpful: "Extent

and Security of the Empire," "Travel within the Empire," "Social Day of a Roman Aristocrat," "Life in the Middle and Lower Classes," "Holidays and Amusements," "Children and Education," "Roman Religion," "Study and Scientific Knowledge," "Philosophy."

The book is handsomely printed in large, clear type, with plentiful illustrations and a good index, and is almost entirely free from typographical errors.

F. J. MILLER

*Index Verborum Vergilianus.* By MONROE NICHOLS WETMORE, PH.D., Assistant Professor of Latin in Williams College. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911. Pp. viii+554. \$4.00, postage 26 cents.

This is a "complete word-index to the acknowledged works of Vergil, the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid*, and to the poems usually included in the *Appendix Vergiliana*." It is made on the basis of Ribbeck's text edition of 1895, but includes variants from Ribbeck's critical edition of 1894 and from other standard critical editions as well. Every occurrence of every word is given in the form in which it occurs, and these are arranged in the usual paradigm order of the several words. After each word is printed a numeral indicating the number of times of its occurrence.

Of the *Indices* hitherto available, the only one which can come into possible comparison with the present volume is the excellent and professedly complete *Index* of Heyne, published as the sixth volume of his large edition of Vergil. The great advantages of the modern *Index*, however, are, primarily, the access to the better established texts of Vergil, the much improved press work, and all the convenient and helpful devices which the modern editor has contributed to his book.

Dr. Wetmore has successfully accomplished a task requiring unlimited patience and scholarly accuracy, and has produced a fresh, delightfully clear and usable index which will be gratefully received by all Vergilian scholars.

We learn from the author's preface that this book covers only a part of the original scope of his work, which was to produce a complete *Lexicon Vergilianum*. An announcement of this intention was circulated among scholars throughout the world in 1904 in order to ascertain whether anyone else was planning such a book. No hint of such intention was received from anyone. The work accordingly progressed until about one thousand pages of manuscript were ready for the press, when, in 1909, the announcement was received that H. Merguet, to whom a copy of Dr. Wetmore's circular had been sent in 1905, was about to begin the publication of a *Lexicon zu Vergilius*. Obviously there was not room in the world for two such books, and the American work was accordingly given up.

This is a striking and painful illustration of what happens all too often in the world of scholarship. There seems to be no such thing as the acquisition

of the right of way in a given line of publication, even by timely and sincere announcement. Of course it is true that in many cases the more editions or works along the same line, the better; for instance, Tucker and Dill do not in any way infringe upon one another in their treatment of Roman Life, but on the contrary are usefully supplementary. But in certain other lines, as in the present instance, one work effectually kills the other; and the only proper settlement of such a situation ought to be the recognition by all concerned of the just claims of the author making prior announcement, if he be admittedly competent to accomplish the task. And this recognition by the international courtesy of scholars we trust will some time be accomplished, to the immense saving of good work made useless by the present method of procedure.

F. J. MILLER

---

*Caesar's Gallic War, Books I-IV and Selections from V-VIII.*

With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. By JOHN C. ROLFE, PH.D., Head of the Department of Latin in the University of Pennsylvania, and ARTHUR W. ROBERTS, PH.D., Head of the Classical Department in Brookline High School. New York: Scribner, 1910. Pp. xcvi+343+100.

"The main object of the second year should be to learn to read and translate Latin." In keeping with this profession of the authors, we find the commentary on books I-IV full and helpful on syntax, sentence structure, and the translation of phrases which might give trouble or tempt to an awkward rendering. For tracing Caesar's war game the reader has chapter headings and a dozen maps and plans, but notes on this aspect of the subject are not conspicuous. Syntax references are given, not directly to the school grammars, but to a grammatical introduction of about 60 pages, embracing 227 numbered paragraphs on the syntax of Caesar. Each paragraph contains a concise statement of principle, references to six school grammars, and usually two translated examples, apparently taken so far as possible from book I. Each construction seems to stand as an isolated phenomenon with little to suggest relations between constructions. The phraseology is often very apt, and in general, considering the unarticulated treatment just noted, conforms to the results of modern syntactical study. Many will question the wisdom of tempting the second-year student to defer making the acquaintance of his grammar with its more adequate presentation of Latin syntax as a system. In the text the pupil will not find the perplexing foreign punctuation of relative and substantive clauses common in the older and found in some newer editions; though in this respect the editions of Rolfe and Roberts does not go as far as that of Allen and Greenough or of Walker. It does go farther than any edition of Caesar which we have noticed in marking off with commas

participial phrases logically equivalent to adverbial clauses which in English would be so set off, an altogether commendable feature. The selections from the later books are edited for sight reading with brief notes at the foot of the page only. In a word, we have here a serviceable edition of Caesar of the accepted type, worthy to rank with the best three or four now in use.

W. S. GORDIS

OTTAWA, KANSAS

*The Histories of Tacitus.* Books I-II. Edited by FRANK GARDNER MOORE. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. xxx+249. \$0.60.

This volume contains a short description of the life and works of Tacitus, a more detailed account of his style (under the two headings of Freedom and Concentration), and a brief discussion of his literary critics, followed by a few words upon the text-tradition, a bibliography, the text, and notes. The text follows that of Halm (1907) except in ninety-five places, duly noted in an appendix, many of which are a return to MS readings. Of the emendations adopted the following may be cited. In i. 68 Professor Moore reads *infesto* for the *in sto* of the Medicean (*iusto* vulg.); in i. 69 he inserts before *ut est* the word *tum* (where Heraeus conjectured *mox*); in ii. 12 for *maiore Italiae parte* is substituted *etiam ora Italiae*, a change hardly necessitated by any difficulty in the usual reading; in ii. 40, for *sedecim*, an impossible number in the context, there is inserted XXV, a suggestion of the editor in *P.A.P.A.*, XL, lxiv f.

The notes cover 138 pages and are well written and helpful. On p. ix of the introduction, however, it appears hardly justifiable to draw from the question of the stranger to Tacitus at the circus (Pliny, *Epp.* 9. 23. 2) the inference that Tacitus and Pliny resembled each other in speech or accent and hence that Tacitus probably came from Northern Italy, for the implication of dialectic peculiarities such as would easily have distinguished the two men from all other Roman writers is one which neither the questions and answers nor the context in which the episode is narrated directly suggest and one which Pliny's own pride would have been slow to publish to the world.

The insertion of a map, such as that in the first volume of Wolff's edition, and of an index of proper names would be of great assistance to the student. The question may be raised whether the first three books, ending with the death of Vitellius and the brief estimate of his character, would not present a more complete picture than a selection that stops with the end of the second book, *in mediis rebus*, but the limits set by the series in which this volume appears may have prevented such a choice. To the list of errata, for which the publishers wish to assume entire responsibility, may be added *inius* for *Vinius* on p. 27, l. 11. In general the careful and methodical arrangement of the book and its emphasis upon the essential facts should make it useful and acceptable to the student.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

*The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1910.* Edited by W. H. D. ROUSE. London: John Murray, 1911. Pp. xi+180. 2s. 6d.

One of the most valuable products of the activity of the Classical Association of England and Wales is the annual report of the year's work in classical studies. The fifth report covers for most departments the year ending September 30, 1910; but the report on literature is for a period of two years, while the year's work in Greek history, textual criticism, Hellenistic Greek, and modern Greek has not been sufficient in volume to justify a report for these departments.

These annual reports have become indispensable to teachers who have not access to the more complete technical reviews and bibliographies. Teachers in secondary schools will find them invaluable aids in keeping informed as to the work that is being done in the more special studies in their own departments, and as to progress in the whole classical field. The reports give a fairly full list of the publications of the year, including the more important articles in the journals, and brief criticisms of many of them. Each department has its own editor. Some of the foremost scholars in England contribute to the work.

In the field of archaeology the report for 1910 records no startling discoveries, but the reader must be impressed by the wide extent of the work that is under way, ranging from the newly begun American exploration of Cyrene to the numerous excavations in Roman Britain. Among the more important books noticed are Evans' *Scripta Minoa*, I, Mrs. Boyd Hawes's *Gourniá*, and the first part of Homolle's account of the sculptures of Delphi (*Fouilles de Delphes*, IV). Farnell devotes most of his chapter on "Religion and Mythology" to an unfavorable review of Lawson's *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*. Under "Roman Religion" W. Warde Fowler discusses the original sense of the Latin *religio*. Under "Roman History" high praise is given to Heitland's *Roman Republic*, as being in this field "by far the most profitable book of the year." Especial commendation is given to Heitland's treatment of Cicero. In the review of literature for the two years we note Miss Stawell's *Homer and Iliad*, a book which represents the present "reaction against modern separatists," arguing as it does that "the bulk of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are by the same hand." Other noteworthy books are Roberts' *Dionysius on Literary Composition*, Bywater's *Poetics of Aristotle*, and T. Rice Holmes's translation of Caesar's *Commentaries*. An unusual number of excellent translations of Greek authors is recorded. The chapter on "Papyri" shows the interest and the wide range of questions to be found in this comparatively new field. In the chapter on the New Testament it is encouraging to see that the critical studies of the German schools on the synoptic question are making headway in England. Attention is called to the fact that Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, a most valuable book for orientation on studies in the life of Jesus, is now available in an English translation, under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London, A. and C. Black).

C. D. A.

*Four Plays of Menander: The Hero, Epitrepontes, Periceiomene, and Samia.* Edited, with Introductions, Explanatory Notes, Critical Appendix, and Bibliography, by EDWARD CAPPS, Professor of Classics in Princeton University. 8vo, cloth, pp. x+329. Ginn & Co. \$2.50.

Anyone ignorant of the fate of New Comedy in Greek might on receipt of this book find himself in the frame of mind of the gentleman who began action against the express company to recover for the lost arms of the Venus of Melos. Of the *Hero*, there are left only 80 lines, of the *Samia* 485, and of the *Epitrepontes* and the *Periceiomene* 920 and 907 respectively.

The average student of ancient literature, however, who has heretofore known Menander only through Plautus and Terence and the comparatively few passages which are really serviceable from among the eleven hundred Greek fragments, will be surprised and delighted to find at last within reach an actual and considerable first-hand acquaintance with the foremost writer of New Comedy. Availing himself of the Cairo papyrus discovered by Lefebvre in 1905 and published in 1907, and of the critical literature which has since appeared, Professor Capps has produced one of the most original and scholarly editions in the College Series, and one of the most valuable in content. His introductions to the individual plays bring the student well prepared to the beginning of the mutilated remains; his device for indicating restored parts of the text, a great many of them meritorious contributions of his own, is so neat and unobtrusive that neither the eye nor the thought is subject to the least interruption or annoyance; the method of indicating the probable content of missing passages is also so effective that at the ends of at least the two best preserved of the plays the reader has the impression of having finished a complete work; the notes, well distributed in the fields of syntax, metric, literary parallel, and interpretation, are concise and compact, and yet full; the critical appendix and bibliography are suited to the needs of advanced scholarship. If there is anything to be regretted, it is that the edition has not devoted a little of the space which its author has used to such advantage for the illumination of other phases of learning, to the poet's language and style, and to the significance of his plays in the universal history of comedy. Drama is so distinct and so stimulating a form of literature that the reader of one of its masters never feels satisfied until he has been shown the relation of the part to the whole. An essay of no very great length establishing a connection on the one hand between New and Roman and Old Comedy, and on the other between ancient and modern comedy, would have enhanced the attractive qualities of an edition already little short of perfection.

But let us not forget that the book is really by Menander, and that it would be ungracious to withhold from him his share of credit for its appearance. In these 2,400 lines we are at last able to envisage the "shining star"

who gave New Comedy a large part of its name. It is possible now to appreciate for ourselves the facility of language and the ease of action for which he was praised, the slenderness and yet the effectiveness of his plots, his skill in the portrayal of the life of the men and women among whom he moved—the vivacity of the Athenian character, the broad humor of the slave, the ludicrous aspect and language of the peasant, the impetuosity of youth in love, the calculating coolness of the father, and the affection and self-sacrifice of the mother, the pathetic lot of the hetaira, whose virtues the poet brings to the foreground, and to whose faults he inclines to be charitable. Menander is thoroughly sympathetic in his depiction of life. It all seems very natural and human and gentle. There is enough here, too, to let us see that Caesar's famous coinage—*O dimidiate Menander*—rings true; there is a real and pronounced affinity between Menander and Terence; the same unruffled calm of speech and sunny equipoise of temper that captivated even the Christian enemies of Terence in the days of the early church belong to Menander also—

Quidquid come loquens atque omnia dulcia dicens,

in Cicero's phrase. Of the *vis comica* of the Greek, too, whose lack in Terence the Dictator noticed and regretted, we seem to penetrate the secret. The simplicity of Menander's plot, his familiarity with the life he portrayed, the naturalness and directness of his characterization and action, and the absence of everything that did not belong to actual human existence—"O Menander! O Life! Which of you copied the other?"—all this would very naturally lend to vigor of representation, especially in the plays of a man who had lived longer and seen more of the world than his Latin imitator, whose portrayal was at second hand.

The appearance of Professor Capps's admirable edition will no doubt result in the giving of Menander courses in many colleges. Those teachers who do not read it because they must teach it—or because they must review it—should read it for the delight it will give them.

GRANT SHOWERMAN

---

*Cicero's Letters.* Selected and edited by ERNST RIESS. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. lix+396. \$0.60.

This collection, which is intended for the use of college Freshmen, contains one hundred and forty-six letters, well selected with reference to their general interest. The preface promises "conscientious acknowledgment" of the assistance of predecessors, yet, by some curious oversight, we are nowhere told whose text the editor has elected to follow or what deviations he may have made from it, and the scanty references which are made to other works are too advanced for the average student and too few for the teacher.

The introduction discusses the history of letter-writing; Cicero's letters

and his correspondents; the processes of writing and sending letters in antiquity; and the peculiarities of style of the *sermo cotidianus*. Then follows a full chronology of Cicero's life, conveniently arranged for the student. The introduction and the notes are alike written in a style which is now peculiarly harsh and now extremely obscure. The brevity of the references will make many parts unintelligible to the Freshman, who, in the first paragraph of the introduction, is confronted by Mr. Evans and the Cretan pictographs, only to be led on to the "style of the Chancelleries," "letters of school heads," "laws of Hiatus and Rhythmic Close," and "Gallus" (Becker's work of that name). "Schematisms," "haruspicien," and "gourmandise" (noun) rub shoulders with "made a fearful mess," "do out of," and "rake-off," and French words, whose use is on p. xxxviii duly censured, fairly bristle on p. xxvii. Whether such phrases as "took also away," "Philip's of Macedon mastership over Greece," "adaptable to both his surroundings and to . . .," "rhetorics extended its claims," and many erratic cases of capitalization are due to the editor or to the printer is not always clear, but these and similar infelicities are far too common, and their effect upon the English of the student can hardly be favorable. The references in the section on style are to the *Ad Familiares*, the *Ad Atticum*, etc., but as the passages in question can be found in the text only by way of a comparative table of numbers in the front of the volume the labor of verification is doubled. As no list of abbreviations is given, the student must make his own way through F, A, Q (*Ad Familiares*, etc.), O.O. (*oratio obliqua*), and such abridged expressions as "adjectives of the second."

It is to be regretted that in the statement of facts certain errors and obscurities occur. The paragraph on the MSS (p. xxxii) is ambiguous, and the sentence in regard to the *editio princeps* published "in 1470 both in Rome and Venice" is misleading. "*Medicaci*" may be a misprint, but Coluccio Salutati appears thrice as "*Salutato*," and the "*Dyrrachium*" of the text is elsewhere found as "*Dyrrhachium*." A sentence on p. xxxiii might easily suggest that Sicily was a source for papyrus in Cicero's time. In the chronological table the dates of Cicero's quaestorship and of the composition of the *De Republica* and the *Tusculans* need correction, and several of Cicero's other works are arranged in wrong chronological order. On p. xlii the name of Croesus is put in a bracket beside that of Crassus, but with no explanation; on p. 276, Baiae is somewhat cruelly characterized as "a summer resort of questionable respectability." The note on *pedarii* (p. 281) is partly incorrect and fails altogether to treat the derivation of the word; that explaining *involatu* (p. 355) as "the flight of birds through the Templum" leaves a good deal to the imagination.

The notes are brief and in general helpful, and the index of important proper names at the end of the volume is conveniently arranged, though it is to be regretted that it does not include names of places.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City, or G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

- BALDWIN, FLORENCE T. *The Bellum Civile of Petronius*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Translation. New York: Lemcke & Buechner, 1911. Pp. viii+264. \$1.25.
- BARSS, J. E. *Writing Latin, Book I*. Rev. ed., based on Lodge's *Vocabulary of High School Latin*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1910. Pp. 144. 50 cents.
- BROWN, A. C. B. *Selections from the Latin Literature of the Early Empire*. Oxford University Press, 1910. Pp. 128. \$1.10.
- BURNET, J. *Plato, Apologia, Meno*. (Oxford Classical Texts.) Oxford University Press, 1910. 50 cents.
- FISHER, C. D. *Taciti, Historiae*. (Oxford Classical Texts.) Oxford University Press, 1910. \$1.00.
- HALL, F. A. *Iphigenia in Literature*. A Course of Study Designed for English Readers. St. Louis: Washington University, 1911. Pp. 127. 60 cents.
- HARRY, J. E. *The Antigone of Sophocles Translated into English Verse*. Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Co., 1911. \$1.00.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XXI. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1910. Pp. 171. \$1.50.
- HEADLAM. *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus with Verse Translation, Introduction, and Notes*. Edited by A. C. PEARSON. Cambridge University Press, 1910. Pp. xii+266. 10s.
- HECKER. *The Teaching of Latin in Secondary Schools*. Boston: Schoenhof, 1910. 80 cents.
- KLOTZ. *Caesarstudien*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. 267. M. 6.
- Latin, The Teaching of, at the Perse School, Cambridge*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1910. Pp. 42. 6d.
- LIPPS, G. F. *Weltanschauung und Bildungsideal*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. x+230. M. 4.
- LONG, F. P. *Caesar's Gallic War and Civil War, Translated*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Pp. 286. 2 vols., each 3s. 6d.
- MARCHANT. *Xenophontis Institutio Cyri*. (Oxford Classical Texts.) Oxford University Press, 1910. 90 cents.
- MEDLEY, W. *Interpretations of Horace*. Edited by J. G. SKEMP AND G. W. MACAULPINE. Oxford University Press, 1910. Pp. xvi+169. \$3.00.
- MIEROW. *The Essentials of Latin Syntax*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1911. 90 cents.
- MOSSO, ANGELO. *The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization*. London: Unwin, 1910. Pp. xxiii+424. 16s.
- MYRES, J. L. *Greek Lands and the Greek People*. An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford, November 11, 1910. Oxford University Press, 1910. 50 cents.

- NIEDERMANN, MAX. *Outlines of Latin Phonetics*. Edited by STRONG AND STEWART. London: Routledge & Sons, 1910. Pp. 108. 2s. 6d.
- PHILLIPSON, C. *The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. 2 vols. \$6.50.
- RIDGEWAY. *Minos the Destroyer Rather than the Creator of the So-called "Minoan" Culture of Cnossus*. Oxford University Press, 1910. 80 cents.
- ROUSE. *The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1910*. London: Murray, 1911. Pp. xi+180. 2s. 6d.
- SOUTER, A. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Revisers' Text, with a New Apparatus Criticus. Oxford University Press, 1910. Pp. xxiv+480. \$1.00.
- THOMPSON, D'A. W. *The Historia Animalium of Aristotle*. Vol. IV of the Works of Aristotle Translated into English under the Editorship of J. A. SMITH AND W. D. ROSS. Oxford University Press, 1910. \$3.40.
- WILLIAMS, T. H. *Theognis: Text, Introduction, Commentary, and Appendices*. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. xvi+264. \$2.25.
- WOLF. *Sentenz und Reflexion bei Sophokles*. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1910. Pp. vi+177. M. 4.50.
- WOODHOUSE, S. C. *English-Greek Dictionary*. A Vocabulary of the Attic Language. London: Routledge & Sons, 1910. Pp. 1038. 15s.
- THALHEIM, TH. *Xenophontis Scripta Minora*. Fasciculus prior, Oeconomicum, Convivium, Hieronem, Agesilaum, Apologiam, Socratis continens. Post LUDOVICUM DINDORF ed. TH. THALHEIM. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. xvi+234. M. 1.40.